UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/592,014	02/08/2007	Kiichiro Kato	24-037-TN	7013
23400 POSZ LAW GF	7590 03/26/201 <sup>1</sup> ROUP, PLC	EXAMINER		
12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE			VONCH, JEFFREY A	
	SUITE 101 RESTON, VA 20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/592,014	KATO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeff A. Vonch	1794				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
<i>,</i>						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	pance Quayre, 1000 0.21 1.1, 10	0 0. <b>0</b> . <b>2</b> . 0.				
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/592,014 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.
- 2. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
- 3. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3, drawn to a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet.

Group II, claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a method of manufacturing a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet. Group III, claim(s) 8-10, drawn to a release liner.

Group IV, claim(s) 11-14, drawn to a method of manufacturing a release liner.

- 4. The inventions listed as Groups I, II, III, IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:
- 5. Hashizume (JP 07-164873) teaches a car film (pressure sensitive adhesive sheet) that has a main film (base layer) (Fig. 1 [1]) with gas passing channels (Fig. 1 [H]) that pass in the thickness direction to the pressure sensitive adhesive layer (Fig. 1 [1a]) with holes (Fig. 1 [H]) in communication with each other [0004]. The exfoliation film that provides for free attachment and detachment (release liner) has a plurality of bottomed holes that open out to the release surface (Fig. 1 [2a]). This would incorporate claims 1 and 8, teaching the corresponding

Art Unit: 1794

technical feature. Because the corresponding technical feature is taught, the claims lack unity and therefore restriction is required.

- 6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.
- 7. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.
- 8. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
  - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
  - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
  - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
  - (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

Application/Control Number: 10/592,014

Art Unit: 1794

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Page 4

- 9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include
  (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.
- 10. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.
- 11. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.
- 12. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Application/Control Number: 10/592,014

Art Unit: 1794

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR

Page 5

1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

14. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

15. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/592,014 Page 6

Art Unit: 1794

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jeff A. Vonch whose telephone number is (571) 270-1134. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8:30-6:00 EST.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Sample can be reached on (571) 272-1376. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R. Sample/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/J. A. V./

Jeff A. Vonch

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010